

**ROCKY FLATS CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD
MINUTES OF WORK SESSION**

April 6, 2000
6 — 9:30 p.m.

Westminster City Hall, lower-level Multi-Purpose Room
4800 West 92nd Avenue, Westminster, Colorado

FACILITATOR: Reed Hodgkin

Gerald DePoorter, the Board's chair, called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT: Ray Betts, Jerry DePoorter, Joe Downey, Tom Gallegos, Victor Holm, Jim Kinsinger, Bill Kossack, Tom Marshall, Mary Mattson, Markuené Sumler, Bryan Taylor / Steve Gunderson, Joe Legare, Tim Rehder

BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ABSENT: Shawn Burke, Bruce Dahm, Eugene DeMayo, Jeff Eggleston, Mary Harlow, LeRoy Moore, David Navarro

PUBLIC / OBSERVERS PRESENT: Bill Shearer (SeaCrest Group), Ray Hoffman (citizen); David Grover (DNFSB); Don Owen (DNFSB); Russell McCallister (RFETS); Louise Janson (citizen); Joe Goldfield (RSALOP); V. Winters (citizen); Mike Rabin (citizen); Ann Lockhart (CDPHE); Teresa Porreco (citizen); John Corsi (K-H); Ken Korkia (CAB staff); Erin Rogers (CAB staff); Deb Thompson (CAB staff)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: No comments were received.

REGULATOR UPDATE — DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD: David Grover and Don Owen gave an update on Rocky Flats and DNFSB issues.

- **General Issues.** This year the Board has issued two recommendations. First, 2000-1 pertains to improved schedule for remediation of nuclear materials, and is a follow-on recommendation to 94-1 and applies mainly to Hanford and Savannah River — not much impact is expected at Rocky Flats. The second is 2000-2, configuration management for safety systems, which will have impact on Rocky Flats. One of the main safety systems this recommendation is concerned with is building ventilation systems. DNFSB's annual report is now available on its web site at www.dnfsb.gov.
- **Risk Reduction.** For the plutonium packaging system, which was to have started operations in January but was delayed, the welding problems on the inner can have been resolved. Because of the delays, it is no longer advantageous for the site to package metal first. A combined start-up — including oxides — will now be done, which will further delay the start-up of the packaging system until August at the earliest. Staff has reviewed contamination controls in the gloveboxes, and feel the modifications being made to the gloveboxes are an improvement. Regarding Building 771 solution draining, they are nearing completion of the 1999 milestone for draining eight solution systems, seven are already completed, and it should be finished five or six months early. The site is re-evaluating processes for the pipe draining and removal

ADMIN RECORD

SW-A-005355

to allow removal of the systems in groups. As for residues, processing is continuing. The site proposes to remove material from Building 707 to support shrinking the Protected Area and reduce risk. Process lines may be removed from Building 707 to Building 371 to allow for consolidation. Most of the nuclear material would then be removed from Building 707 by the end of this year. There have been problems in Building 371 in the past few months with administrative control programs, and problems with ventilation systems. Reviews are being conducted to help correct administrative control deficiencies, and work continues on fixing the ventilation systems.

- **D&D Activities.** In Building 771, a new system for glovebox size reduction is being used, called the "inner tent chamber" that allows for a box to be placed inside, and for ventilation to reduce airborne contamination levels that happen when the contaminated boxes are cut apart. In the last three months, about 30 gloveboxes and related items have been size reduced. Data shows that airborne levels are greatly reduced, but the supplied air suits are still required. A subsequent design for the inner tent chamber system has been improved to provide more confinement and ventilation, and hopefully workers will eventually be able to work without the bubble suits. Finally, a robotics project — using a fully self-contained system — is planned to be used for D&D in Building 776. This system should come online in the late summer and fall.
- **Miscellaneous.** Conduct of operations, adherence to procedures, has been less than satisfactory lately. There have been more criticality safety deficiencies, some which point to a weakness in conduct of operations. DNFSB staff had observed problems with hazard analysis in the area of work planning and control. Kaiser-Hill has drafted some changes to the integrated work control program — the changes start in April — and DNFSB will monitor this closely. Regarding Kaiser-Hill restructuring, the company has assumed direct day-to-day supervision of operations from the subcontractors — RMRS and Safe Sites of Colorado — which includes direct responsibility for safety. And finally, both DNFSB staff have urged appropriate follow-up to occurrences.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ON SOIL ACTION LEVELS: Victor Holm, RFCAB member, along with Hank Stovall and Neils Schonbeck — members of the Soil Action Level Oversight Panel — gave a presentation on the results of the study that was completed last month. The report has been finalized and a public meeting was held in late March. A summary of the public meeting was distributed to Board members.

First, Hank Stovall, co-chair of the Oversight Panel, gave a brief summary of the process involved and the panel's work. In the summer of 1996, the RFCA document signed by the principals (DOE, EPA, and CDPHE) set interim Radionuclide Soil Action Levels (RSALs), which set the upper limits for radionuclides allowed in the soil at Rocky Flats after remediation. The community was concerned at the numbers established, as they were higher than anticipated and much higher than levels established for remediation at other sites. RFCAB gave recommendations in the fall of October 1996 expressing its concern with the numbers that were set. Cities located downgradient from the site were also extremely concerned. After many meetings, DOE agreed to publicly fund an independent review of the process of how the interim soil action levels were determined. A funding level of \$500,000 was approved. A citizens group was formed — the Soil Action Level Oversight Panel. Panel members included various individuals with a wide range of backgrounds, including city and county governments, RFCAB members, academic institutions, environmental activists, and other engineering and environmental science disciplines. The

panel also included ex-officio representatives from DOE, EPA, and CDPHE. The first meeting of the panel was held in January 1998. Scopes of work were developed for an administrative service contractor, a technical contractor, and a peer review team. In July 1998, Risk Assessment Corporation (RAC) was selected to serve as the technical contractor. A contract was signed in October 1998; RAC began work in November 1998. The study was completed and a final report was issued in March 2000. The project was comprised of eight tasks: 1) review cleanup levels at other sites; 2) compare computer models used to calculate RSALs; 3) evaluate project inputs and assumptions; 4) review the methodologies; 5) perform an independent calculation of RSALs for Rocky Flats; 6) make recommendations for developing a soil sampling protocol; 7) interact with the Actinide Migration Evaluation Panel; and finally 8) incorporate public involvement in the review process.

Next, Niels Schonbeck reviewed the findings made by Risk Assessment Corporation. RAC has assigned uncertainties to the values that are not known precisely — for instance, plutonium resuspension or plutonium risk due to a certain dose. Using a 15 millirem dose standard, RAC calculated the soil concentration level in which they could be 95% certain that the 15 millirem dose would not be exceeded. To be most protective, RAC determined that a scenario that is realistic for the future must be used, and that close to the highest concentration would be used. A goal for designing the scenario is that if the hypothetical individual living on or using the site is protected, then it is reasonable to assume others will also be protected. RAC used a scenario that included a rancher, or a child or infant, living in the area, and included the probability of a fire. With a fire, vegetation would be burned off and the resuspension of the soil would be increased significantly. Inhalation of resuspended plutonium is the major pathway. So the impact of a fire, even though infrequent, could significantly increase resuspension of soil, which would result in a lower RSAL. Parameters considered in these scenarios included the amount of time on the site, both indoors and outdoors; breathing rates; soil ingestion; an irrigation water source and drinking water source; and contaminated homegrown produce. The most restrictive scenario — with the probability of a fire taken into account — formed the basis of RAC's analysis. RAC did not consider during the course of their analysis: 1) the cost of cleanup; 2) risks to the public associated with cleanup; 3) institutional controls; 4) risks associated with the prescribed dose limit; 5) background of plutonium in the environment; and 6) community values.

Then, a panel group answered questions, including representatives from DOE, EPA, CDPHE, and the Soil Action Level Oversight Panel members who gave the presentation. Questions and comments ranged from the difference between using an open space versus rancher scenario; the methodology used by RFCA principals to set the original RSALs and comparison with RAC methodologies; would a cap on the 903 Pad and plume area prevent resuspension of soil in the air, whether or not a fire occurred; assumptions used in the fire scenario; can the findings be applied to a different dose level; how will the change to the soil action level number affect the cleanup at Rocky Flats, also what additional costs and how much more time would be involved.

EPA is preparing a cost analysis of the 903 Pad cleanup, which they believe will be the biggest environmental soil cleanup at the site. There is still a lot of uncertainty about how much contamination is under the buildings, but potentially that could be considerably less than what is at the 903 Pad. EPA is developing a plan for that remediation and hopes to have cost estimates by next month. That information should help in the discussion of how much remediation and cleanup is reasonable. EPA's cost estimates should help to determine the difference in cost between cleanup at the interim soil action level, and cleanup to the

soil action level as proposed by RAC. The agencies have not yet held a meeting to discuss how they will determine a course of action to address the revised soil action levels. The RAC report must be reviewed technically by the agencies. The EPA rule has been withdrawn and the only rule in place now is the NRC rule, which the State Board of Health has adopted as a state rule. A public process will need to be put in place, and the agencies would like to have the Board's input on how such a public process should be designed.

Next steps: The RSAL Oversight Panel will continue to meet for the next four months at scheduled meetings in Broomfield. In addition, the Rocky Flats Coalition of Local Governments is interested in cleanup levels and would like to be included in the future public process for soil action levels. Possible options for the Board's path forward include working through the Stewardship Committee, in cooperation with the Coalition, or to form its own focus group to study the issue. DOE and the agencies will review the RAC report in hopes of making a decision by the end of this year. DOE asked that the Board consider how it would like to be involved in that process, and how the public process might look. That will need to be decided fairly quickly. The Board agreed at this point to track the review process by the agencies. Then as the review progresses, the Board may decide to form a separate focus group to help decide whether it will take a formal stand on the RAC report. In the meantime, the ad hoc Caps Committee will expand its scope to include the issue of institutional controls as it relates to the soil action levels. A proposal was made to have the Board transmit the RAC report formally to DOE, but that item was tabled.

UPDATE ON TEST BURN: A test burn was conducted on April 6 beginning at 9 a.m. Conditions were ideal for the burn, and the Forest Service performed the burn. The acreage burned was approximately 50 acres, in an area just north of Highway 72 and just east of Highway 93. The burn lasted approximately one hour. Air samples were taken, and split samples are being held for future analysis if necessary. Preliminary scans showed radon was present. The samples are being analyzed at the site, and it will take about five days to have results available. The wind tunnel experiments were also begun at the time of the burn and will be ongoing to monitor the resuspension during regrowth in the area. EPA brought two high-volume samplers to do independent air monitoring at both an upwind and downwind location. One monitor took samples directly from the smoke area. Those samples will be sent to an offsite laboratory for independent analysis. Tim Rehder noted that the grass was quite damp, yet the burn went very fast. He believes that demonstrated how quickly a wildfire could spread out of control after a hot, dry summer. The ground has mostly burned vegetation, and not soil just exposed to the atmosphere. Site representatives expect the area to be completely green by the end of the month. DOE will take video footage as it progresses to demonstrate what happens after the burn.

Tom Marshall asked the Board to consider drafting a letter to the City of Boulder, based on the city's resolution regarding the controlled burn, which asked the Board to "take an official position asking DOE to delay the burn until they are satisfied there are no negative impacts to human health and the environment as a result of any burn." Tom asked the Board to send a response to the City of Boulder stating the Board will review the issue and consider taking a position in the future. However, Board members were not comfortable with the idea of this letter and did not want to consider this item at the Board meeting.

UPDATE BY STEWARDSHIP COMMITTEE: The Stewardship Committee has had numerous meetings with the Coalition. At the last meeting, participants agreed to bring a proposal back to their respective boards regarding membership in the upcoming stewardship dialogue. RFCAB representatives have advocated for a broad membership in the dialogue

group, which would include any Board member and Coalition member who wished to be involved could be involved, and other members of the public who were interested could also participate. The Coalition did not want to have such a broad representation on the dialogue group. In discussion with the Coalition, a compromise was reached that would call for an initial group consisting solely of Board and Coalition members. Members of the public could participate in the meetings; however, they would not have decision-making authority. The meetings will be advertised, and after six months the group would re-evaluate and consider adding more members. In order to proceed, the Board was asked to decide if it could endorse the compromise approach so that dialogue planning could continue. Board members expressed several concerns, including the timing of meetings, scheduling meetings in the evening so that it is easier for members of the public to attend, and that meetings need to be held regularly and with adequate notice. Generally the Board agreed it is important to continue the partnership with the Coalition. The next meeting of the group will be held on April 26. Staff was asked to draft a letter from the Board that addresses the Board's concerns, listing the issues that must be addressed in order for RFCAB to continue participation, and which will serve as a guideline for how RFCAB will participate with the Coalition. That letter will be sent to the Board via email for its comment, consideration, and decision before being approved.

SELECT DATE FOR JUNE CAB RETREAT: In order for CAB to have its next grant application and budget in place by October 1, the normal cycle up for developing a work plan and budget must be moved up. A budget and work plan for 2001 will need to be developed for approval at the Board's July meeting. To accommodate this schedule, the Board must have its annual retreat in June. The Board selected Saturday, June 17, for this retreat. Eugene DeMayo and Joe Downey are the only members who would not be able to participate on this date. Staff will find a location for the retreat and begin planning.

UPDATE ON THE RECENT SSAB CHAIRS MEETING: In mid-February, Ken Korkia, Tom Marshall, and Jerry DePoorter met with the chairs and other representatives from the SSABs across the weapons complex. Participants went on a tour of Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL), where they visited the experimental breeder reactor, the waste management complex, as well as other interesting areas at the site. At the meeting, participants received presentations about the budget, guidelines for SSABs, and received other informational materials. The SSAB chairs worked on preparing a set of common values for all the SSABs. The draft values are still general, and cover areas such as what is expected from DOE regarding cleanup and budget, health and safety, etc. The chairs are continuing to work on the list of common values via conference calls. Hopefully the statement of common values will be adopted at the next chairs meeting to be held in August at Pantex. RFCAB will have an opportunity to review and comment on the value statement prior to that meeting.

SSAB STEWARDSHIP SEMINAR: RFCAB is sponsoring the SSAB Stewardship Seminar to be held in Denver October 24-29, at the Executive Tower Hotel. A group has met to prepare a draft itinerary and to work out some of the details that need to be handled and planned for prior to the meeting. The SSAB chairs will develop the agenda for the seminar. Board members were asked to volunteer to assist with this effort. All RFCAB members will be able to attend the meetings. Bryan Taylor and Jerry DePoorter have offered to serve as co-chairs of the steering committee working on this project.

UPDATE ON AD HOC CAPS COMMITTEE FORMATION: A date has been set for the first meeting of this committee, and that will be held on Wednesday, April 19, at 6 p.m.

at the RFCAB office. Tentatively, the committee will need to decide on the committee's organization, such as electing co-chairs and deciding on an official name for the group, and prepare a work scope. Some ideas for the group to consider in its work scope include the timeline for decision of remediation strategies; the nature of the problem, i.e. contamination, at remedy locations; RFCA's approach to remedy selection; possible remedies and their merits and implications; and the success of remedy selections in other settings. Staff will send out an email with a draft proposed agenda and suggested topics for discussion at the first meeting.

DISCUSSION OF BOARD AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

COMMUNICATIONS: As discussed at last month's meeting, the Executive Committee sent out via email a copy of its agenda for the monthly meeting, and then followed up with a meeting summary after the meeting was held. Board members were asked if that was an adequate means of communicating what the Executive Committee is working on. Members agreed that was a good start to help keep Board members informed about Executive Committee actions and decisions.

NEXT MEETING:

Date: May 4, 6 - 9:30 p.m.

Location: College Hill Library, 3705 West 112th Avenue, Westminster

Agenda: Panel discussion on worker health and safety issues; follow-up on soil action level review by regulators; update on results of test burn and/or controlled burn; committee updates

ACTION ITEM SUMMARY: ASSIGNED TO:

1. Draft a letter regarding path forward for Stewardship Committee; send to Board members for review, comment, and consideration via email - Staff
2. Find location for retreat; begin planning details - Staff

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:45 P.M. *

(* Taped transcript of full meeting is available in CAB office.)

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Mary Harlow, Secretary
Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board

The Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board is a community advisory group that reviews and provides recommendations on cleanup plans for Rocky Flats, a former nuclear weapons plant outside of Denver, Colorado.

[Top of Page](#) | [Index of Meeting Minutes](#) | [Home](#)

[Citizens Advisory Board Info](#) | [Rocky Flats Info](#) | [Links](#) | [Feedback & Questions](#)